

the opportunity to further explore this matter. One of the concerns raised by the family was that the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT) had not served the court petition to the Cho Hung Bank and Daelim Industries. I have now been assured that this action has been taken. I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated September 22, 1999 from the First Secretary of the Congressional Section of the South Korean Embassy be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
Washington, DC, September 22, 1999.

Mr. SEAN MOORE,
Office of Senator Barbara Boxer,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MOORE, in reference to my letter dated August 6, 1999, concerning the case of Mr. Cho Bong-Koo, I am pleased to inform you that, according to the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT), the Cho Hung Bank and the Daelim Industrial Company have each received a court petition at the end of August.

The Embassy has also learned that these two entities are planning to establish legal counsel to represent their interests regarding this lawsuit. As was mentioned in the attached letter dated August 24, 1998 and addressed to Senator Boxer, the Korean Government is of the view that any remaining questions in transferring the management of Samho in the 1980's should be settled through legal procedures in court.

I thank you again for your interests and concern.

Sincerely yours,

CHANG BEOM KIM,
First Secretary,
Congressional Section.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I also have received assurances from the South Korean Ambassador, Dr. Lee Hong-koo, that his government will not interfere with the pending court case and expresses hope that legal proceedings will be conducted as quickly as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me dated November 5, 1999 from Ambassador Lee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
Washington, DC, November 5, 1999.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER, I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your support for the ratification of the U.S.-Korea Extradition Treaty.

I would also like to commend you on your efforts to assist your Korean-American constituent, Mr. Cho Bong-Koo, who has filed suit in the Los Angeles Superior Court against several Korean corporations.

I understand your concerns about this case and have considered it with the utmost gravity. Given our respect for the integrity of the U.S. legal system, it is inappropriate for the Embassy or any Korean government official to interfere in a case pending in your courts. However, in view of the long duration of this matter of concern to the Cho family, I remain hopeful that the legal proceedings will

be conducted in a timely manner, so that the case may be resolved without delay.

Please be assured that I understand your endeavor to help ameliorate your constituent's concerns. As a public servant in a democratic government, I fully recognize the importance of your efforts. It is my belief that we will continue to work well together on future matters.

Sincerely,

LEE HONG-KOO,
Ambassador.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I support this treaty and will allow it to be cleared by the full Senate. I will continue to work with the Cho family and the South Korean government and hope that it can be resolved in a timely matter.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for a division vote on the resolutions of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division has been requested.

Senators in favor of the ratification of these treaties, please stand and be counted. (After a pause.) Those opposed will rise and stand until counted.

On this vote, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification are agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am prepared to recite the closing script, but I understand the distinguished Senator from Alabama wants to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator want to go through with that and just accept whatever statement the Senator from Alabama wishes to make?

Mr. DOMENICI. All right.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1999

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, November 8. I further ask consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business, with Senators speaking for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator THOMAS or des-

ignee, from 12 until 1 o'clock; Senator REID or designee, from 1 to 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. DOMENICI. Pursuant to the agreement on S. 625, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open until 5 p.m. for the filing of amendments to the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, at 12 noon on Monday, the Senate will begin a period of morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume debate on the bankruptcy reform legislation. By a previous consent agreement, the minority leader or his designee will be recognized at 3 p.m. to offer an amendment relative to the minimum wage, which will then be set aside so that the majority leader or his designee can be recognized to offer an amendment relative to business costs. Votes on these amendments have been set to occur at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 9.

The leader has announced that the first vote of next week will occur on Monday at 5:30 p.m. in relation to the bankruptcy bill. During the next week's session, the Senate will also consider the foreign operations appropriations bill, which has been received from the House, and any other appropriations bills that are available for action.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama be granted permission to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the Senator will yield, I believe Senator WYDEN also wanted to make remarks for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. All right. Which Senator?

Mr. SESSIONS. Senator WYDEN, before we adjourn.

Mr. DOMENICI. OK.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, except that there be time remaining for the distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, and 10 minutes for Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

(The remarks of Mr. SESSIONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1873 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent at this point to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICARE COVERAGE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have been coming to the floor now on a number of occasions, as we move toward the end of our work for this year, in an effort to try to build bipartisan support for ensuring that senior citizens can get prescription drugs under their Medicare.

There is one bipartisan bill now before the Senate. It is the legislation that Senator SNOWE and I have introduced together. Fifty-four Members of the Senate have voted for this bill. It seems so sad that the Senate cannot come together on an issue such as this and provide some real relief for the Nation's older people.

So as part of this effort to get bipartisan support for legislation to cover seniors for their prescription drug bills, I have come to the floor and urged seniors to send in copies of their prescription drug bills, to send in copies of their bills to all of us here in the Senate in Washington, DC. I hope that in doing that, it will help generate some awareness about how serious a problem this really is for the Nation's older people.

As I have done on previous occasions, I come to the floor to discuss some of these letters. This afternoon, I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about a handful of the letters I have received from senior citizens in my hometown of Portland. We have read from letters from seniors across the State of Oregon in the past. Today, I thought I would look to my hometown and describe a little bit about what the seniors are faced with in terms of trying to pay these prescription bills.

One elderly widow wrote me in the last couple of days from Portland to describe her situation as one where she has a monthly income of \$806. She spends about \$150 of that monthly income on her prescriptions. She indicates she is having problems paying for these very large prescription drug bills. When asked by our staff what she does in a situation such as this, she just said: I do without and pray. That was her response to the question of making sure she could get help with her prescriptions. She goes on to say, when we asked her about choosing between food and fuel and health care—we have literally millions of our Nation's seniors today walking on an economic tight-

rope, balancing these costs, medical bills against their fuel bills. When we asked her how she handled the situation with respect to her medicine, she said: I just wait. I always pay the utilities first.

Now, this isn't some kind of statistic or abstract kind of matter that the think tanks are debating here in the beltway. This is a senior citizen back home in Portland, my hometown. She has a monthly income of \$806. She spends \$150 of it on her prescription medicines. When she can't afford her prescriptions, she writes me: I just do without and pray.

How is it that a country as rich and strong and powerful as ours can't provide some relief to an elderly widow with an income of \$806 a month, spending more than \$150 of it on her prescriptions and literally having to pray she will get some help with her medical bills? How is it that our country, so strong and so good, can't come up with a plan to help an elderly widow such as this?

Senator SNOWE and I are part of a bipartisan team trying to address it. The Snowe-Wyden legislation has garnered 54 votes on the floor of the Senate in terms of its funding plan. Already a majority of the Senate is on record as saying this is an appropriate way to try to fund a prescription drug benefit for older people. I am concerned—this is right at the heart of the philosophy behind the Snowe-Wyden legislation—that if we don't act, and act in a bipartisan way, in this session of the Congress before we wrap up our business next year, it will be years before older people get some help with their prescription drugs.

I am very often asked at town hall meetings and other gatherings whether our Nation can afford to cover prescription drugs. My view is, we cannot afford not to cover these prescription drugs. Not only are we hearing about the suffering in these letters I keep bringing to the floor of the Senate, but we are seeing in so many instances that if older people could get just a little bit of help with their prescription drug costs, that would help our country save much more expensive medical bills down the road.

I have repeatedly cited on this floor the anticoagulant drugs. That seems to me a particularly good example. The evidence shows that if older people can get help with some of these anticoagulant medicines—the cost might be \$1,000 a year for help with anticoagulant medicines—they could save the cost they might incur if they suffer a stroke as a result of not getting their medicines. Those costs can be upwards of \$100,000 a year. That is, in effect, the kind of challenge with which we are faced. Either we address this issue on a bipartisan basis—that is what the Snowe-Wyden legislation is all about—or we continue to have our senior citizens suffering, whether it is in Alabama, Oregon, or any other State. This is an area where we can work in a bipartisan way.

In the Snowe-Wyden legislation, we reject price controls. This isn't a run from Washington, one-size-fits-all Federal approach. We try to use marketplace forces, the ingenuity of the marketplace to give senior citizens some clout. It is a model we all know something about. Federal employees in Alabama and Oregon use the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. It is marketplace oriented. It gives folks choices and options and alternatives. That is the model behind the Snowe-Wyden legislation.

Our bill is called SPICE, the Senior Prescription Insurance Coverage Equity Act. With a majority of the Senate already having voted for a funding plan for the program, we think that is the way to proceed.

As seniors hear us on the floor of the Senate talking about this issue and urging that folks send us copies of their prescription drug bills to the Senate in Washington, DC, they may have other ideas than the Snowe-Wyden legislation. The important thing is, there is no reason this Senate cannot come together in a bipartisan fashion and act in a way to provide real and meaningful relief to the Nation's older people.

I will cite another couple of examples of older people who have been writing us in recent days. An elderly gentleman from Portland, again, describes taking five drugs, a lot of them very familiar—Minocin, nitroglycerin for blood pressure, for heart ailments connected with diabetes. This gentleman has a monthly income of about \$900. He is spending about \$170 from his monthly income on prescriptions.

We talked to him about what it means for him to be in this kind of financial crunch where, out of a monthly income of \$900, \$170 of it goes for prescriptions. He reports that if he could have a little bit of help with his prescriptions, he would have money for other things he describes as clothing.

So we are not talking about seniors getting help with their prescriptions and then suddenly using it for some sort of luxury or something that might be considered nonessential. These seniors are talking about not having enough money to pay for essentials. When they can't get help for their prescription drugs, such as this elderly gentleman in Portland, this gentleman said, in effect, he can't afford his clothing. He cannot afford clothing.

Of course, that, to some extent, is a health-related kind of matter because older people are susceptible to illness. This is getting to be the colder part of the year. These are folks who, if they can't get adequate clothing, may pick up illnesses as a result of not being able to afford warm clothes.

What we are talking about may not be of great importance to some of these think tanks in Washington. I have seen they are putting out all kinds of reports that this is not all that important to seniors. I talk to senior citizens at home in Oregon. The seniors we are